Case 4:15-cr-00345-JD Document 8 Filed 06/17/15 Page 1 of 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA OAKLAND DIVISION

United States of America,) Case No. 4-15-70734 - MAG
Plaintiff,) STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING) TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
v. Castorena))
Defendant.	
Trial Act from, to	he record on, the Court excludes time under the Speedy, and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The continuance on the following factors:
Failure to grant a continuous See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)	nance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. $(7)(B)(I)$.
defendants, the nature of or law, that it is unreason	r so complex, due to <i>[circle applicable reasons]</i> the number of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact hable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial hits established by this section. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	uance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, xercise of due diligence. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
The state of the s	uance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given d case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. (7)(B)(iv).
	nance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time reparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. (7)(B)(iv).
	the record, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. ith the consent of the defendant under Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure
	the record, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. delay resulting from removal/transport of the defendant to another district.
IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: 6/17/15	Hon. Donna M. Ryu Kanais Wester &
STIPULATED:	United States Magistrate Judge

Attorney for Defendant

Assistant United States Attorney